



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,197	01/31/2001	Leland James Wiesehuegel	AUS920000945US1	4475
45993 7590 02/12/2007 IBM CORPORATION (RHF) C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ P. O. BOX 23324 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123			EXAMINER GARCIA, ERNESTO	
			ART UNIT 3679	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

09/773,197

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20070205

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed on January 17, 2007 has been acknowledged. In particular, the remarks to the non-appealable matters have been noted.

DANIEL P. STODOLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

In re the Application of:

Leland James Wiesehuegel)

Serial Number: 09/773,197)

Group:3679

Docket Number: AUS920000945US1)

Examiner: Eric K. Nicholson

Filed on: 01/31/2001)

For: "Dynamic Catalog for On-Line)

Offering and Bid System")

REPLY BRIEF

In Appellants' Second Appeal Reinitiation

Appellants maintain all arguments presented in their Appeal Brief, and wish to respond to the following specific points made in the Examiner's Answer dated 11/17/2006.

Objections are Reviewable by the Board

In the Examiner's Answer, it was stated that the objections from which the Appellants have requested relief are not appealable matter, but instead are petitionable matter, citing MPEP §1002 and §1201.

The Board has proper jurisdiction to review all of these objections because:

- (a) The Board has jurisdiction over the examiner's decision to finally deny the patentability of this patent application because some of the claims have been rejected at least twice or have been finally rejections:

35 U.S.C. §134(a) . . . An applicant for a patent, any of whose claims has been twice rejected, may appeal from the decision of the primary examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences . . .

The facts of this case are that this application has been finally rejected *three* times, and *twice* reopened for examination following filing of Appeal Briefs.

Noted
2/7/07
DPS